

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 6-13 are pending in the case.

Any rejection of record in the previous action not addressed in this office action is withdrawn.

The following are new rejections:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The MPEP states that the purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him. The courts have stated:

To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention."

Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Gostelli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written

description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention.” *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Further, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.* the court stated:

A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, “requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,” of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials. *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601; *In re Smythe*, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284985 (CCPA 1973) (“In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus . . .”) *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP further states that if a biomolecule is described only by a functional characteristic, without any disclosed correlation between function and structure of the sequence, it is “not a sufficient characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence.” MPEP § 2163.

The MPEP does state that for a generic claim the genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. MPEP § 2163. If the genus has a substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within that genus. See MPEP § 2163. Although the MPEP does not define what constitute a sufficient number of representative species, the courts have indicated what do not constitute a

representative number of species to adequately describe a broad generic. In *Gostelli*, the courts determined that the disclosure of two chemical compounds within a subgenus did not describe that subgenus. *In re Gostelli*, 872, F.2d at 1012, 10 USPQ2d at 1618.

The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include: (1) Actual reduction to practice, (2) Disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas, (3) Sufficient relevant identifying characteristics (such as: i. Complete structure, ii. Partial structure, iii. Physical and/or chemical properties, iv. Functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed, and correlation between function and structure), (4) Method of making the claimed invention, (5) Level of skill and knowledge in the art, and (6) Predictability in the art.

“Disclosure of any combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient.” MPEP § 2163. While all of the factors have been considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

In the instant case, the claims are drawn to a genus of vectors comprising fadL gene in which all of the base sequence following the ninth loop of the fadL gene has been removed, wherein the fusion protein is expressed on the surface of the cell . . . It is noted that the encompassed fadL genes include those fadL genes with more than the above mentioned "base sequence following the ninth loop" removed, i.e. deletions of more base sequences than those following the "ninth loop

As stated *supra*, the MPEP states that written description for a genus can be achieved by a representative number of species within a broad generic. It is unquestionable that claim(s) 1 and 6-13 are broad and generic, with respect to all possible compounds encompassed by the claims. The possible structural variations are numerous to any vector comprising any fadL C-terminal truncation in which the base sequence following the “ninth loop” is deleted, which would encompass any fadL gene with deletions of any number of C-terminal amino acids, as long as those following the ninth loop are amongst those deleted. Furthermore, regarding claim 8, the genus encompasses any modification of the host cell wherein protease that degrades the target protein, cannot be produced, causing “the advantage of the cell surface expression of the target protein”, and therefore encompasses broad and non-specific alterations that have this affect. Specifically, the claims lack written description because one of ordinary skill in the art could not reasonably predict which of the C-terminal truncated FadL proteins would, when fused to a target protein encoding gene, yield the result of expression on the surface of a cell. It is clear that experimentation would be required to determine the correct C -terminal truncation of FadL encoding gene, or alterations that have the effect of not producing proteases that degrade the target protein. Applicant has argued that the claims have been amended to recite that “all of the base sequence following the ninth loop of the fadL gene” ; however, the claims do not exclude that more of the fadL gene may be deleted. Furthermore, claim 8 recites any modification of the host cell having any extracellular or intracellular protease that degrades the target protein, which has the result of not being produced, "to the

advantage of the cell surface expression of the target protein". However, there is no description of alterations that prevent protease production that have this affect. Adequate species have not been described, to show possession of this invention. Although the claims recite some functional characteristics, the claims lack written description because there is no disclosure of a correlation between function and structure of the compounds beyond those compounds specifically disclosed in the examples in the specification. Moreover, the specification lack sufficient variety of species to reflect this variance in the genus. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736, F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.") Accordingly, it is deemed that the specification fails to provide adequate written description for the genus of the claims and does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the entire scope of the claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 and by dependence claims 6-13 are vague and indefinite in the recitation "all of the base sequence following the ninth loop of the fadL gene has been removed", since it is not clear what is intended by the ninth loop of the fadL gene. Therefore the intended metes and bounds cannot be determined. Presumably, it is intended that sequences of the portion of the fadL gene which follows the sequence that encodes the ninth loop of the protein, are deleted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Azizan et al. (*J. Bacteriology*, 176, 21, 6653-6662, 1994).

Azizan et al. disclose a vector for expressing a target protein (phoA) comprising a fadL gene encoding an *E. coli* outer membrane protein (FadL), having a deletion of some part of the C-terminal end of the protein, fused to a target protein which is phoA (see Fig. 1). The vector comprises an antibiotic resistant gene, a promoter and a gene encoding the target protein. It cannot be determined exactly which amino acids are deleted from the FadL protein in the fusion with phoA. However, since there is likelihood that at least the amino acids after the ninth loop are deleted, there is likelihood that the fusion protein is displayed on the surface of the *E. coli* cells.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANCY VOGEL whose telephone number is (571)272-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 - 3:30, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Arden Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NANCY VOGEL/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636

NV
5/19/11